

REMARKS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-mentioned Office Action in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-8 remain pending in this application, with Claim 1 being independent. Claims 1 and 6-8 have been amended herein.

Claims 1, 7, and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,799,822 (Cleland et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,004,569 (Mochizuki et al.). Claim 2 was rejected under § 103 over Cleland et al. and Mochizuki et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,755,509 (Silverbrook et al.). Claim 3 was rejected under § 103 over Cleland et al. and Mochizuki et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,121,143 (Hayamizu). Claim 4 was rejected under § 103 over Cleland et al., Mochizuki et al., and Hayamizu and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,789,877 (Murakami et al.). Claim 5 was rejected under § 103 over Cleland et al. and Mochizuki et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,394,588 (Moon et al.). Claim 6 was rejected under § 103 over Cleland et al. and Mochizuki et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,474,790 (Kaneko). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Cleland et al. is directed to a fluid ejection device including heater resistors 309 arranged in a first row 504 and a second row 506, with the resistors being evenly spaced apart in each row. The rows are axially offset by one-half of the resistor spacing to provide an evenly alternating arrangement. An ink supply opening 508 is provided between the first and second rows. However, as recognized in the Office Action, Cleland et al. does not disclose or suggest

that an aspect ratio based on a flow direction of liquid channels of first recording elements is greater than the aspect ratio of second recording elements, with the first and second recording elements corresponding respectively to the first and second outlets, and the first outlets being disposed relatively closer to an inlet and the second outlets being disposed relatively further from the inlet, as is recited in independent Claim 1.

Thus, Cleland et al. fails to disclose or suggest important features of the present invention recited in independent Claim 1.

Mochizuki et al. describes an ink jet printing head including heat generating sections 94 and 96, which have different aspect ratios. The heat generating sections 94, 96 are disposed on a common straight line along an ink flow path, with heat generating section 94 being formed closer to an ink ejection opening than heat generating section 96. Note, for example, column 9, lines 29-37.

Since heaters 94 and 96 are disposed in the same flow path, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Mochizuki et al. to change the aspect ratios of the different resistors in Cleland et al., which are not in the same flow path.

Nevertheless, even assuming, *arguendo*, that Cleland et al. could be modified by the teachings of Mochizuki et al., it is respectfully submitted that Mochizuki et al. is opposite to the present invention. That is, heater 94 is believed to be further from the ink supply inlet and thus would correspond to the second recording element and heater 96 would therefore correspond to the first recording element. Accordingly, in Mochizuki et al., the aspect ratio of the first

recording element (heater 96) is smaller, not greater, than the aspect ratio of the second recording element (heater 94).

Accordingly, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to Mochizuki et al. to modify Cleland et al., but even if combinable, Mochizuki et al. would fail to remedy the deficiencies of Cleland et al. noted above with respect to independent Claim 1.

The remaining citations have been reviewed, but are not believed to be any more relevant than the citations discussed above.

Thus, Claim 1 is patentable over the citations of record. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the § 103 rejections are respectfully requested.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is patentably defined by independent Claim 1. Dependent Claims 2-8 are also allowable, in their own right, for defining features of the present invention in addition to those recited in independent Claim 1. Individual consideration of the dependent claims is requested.

Applicants submit that the present application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration, withdrawal of the rejections set forth in the above-noted Office Action, and an early Notice of Allowability are requested.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Washington, D.C. office by telephone at (202) 530-1010. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark A. Williamson/

Mark A. Williamson
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 33,628

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200